

REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given to the present application. Claims 1-5 and 13-30 remain pending in the present application. Claim 18 has been amended and Claims 6-12 have been cancelled in the present application. Claims 21-30 have been added to the present application. The basis for the above amendments may be found throughout the specification, drawings and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw his rejections in view of the above amendments and remarks as set forth below.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner has objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on December 18, 1998 for failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance of JP Patent No. 56-22473. The present application corresponds to international patent application PCT/JP98/01804 which entered the national phase under 35 U.S.C. §371. Accordingly, the International Bureau should have sent the International Search Report to the United States Designated/Elected Office. Applicant also submitted a copy of the International Search Report with its original application papers. Since the International Search Report cites JP 56-22473, this reference should be considered by the Examiner in accordance with the Patent Cooperation Treaty procedures. Applicant filed an Information Disclosure Statement citing JP

56-22473 in an abundance of caution. Therefore, Applicant requests that the Examiner consider JP 56-22473 in accordance with PCT procedures and consider its relevance as being cited in the search report for the international application.

SPECIFICATION

Pursuant to the Examiner's request, Applicant has checked the specification for minor errors. Applicant also notes that many of the minor errors were corrected in the Preliminary Amendment filed along with the original application papers.

REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §112

The Examiner has rejected Claim 8 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In view of the exemplary claim language provided by the Examiner, Applicant believes the rejection is directed to Claim 18 (as opposed to Claim 8). Accordingly, Claim 18 has been amended to address this rejection. Applicant believes that all pending claims conform to the requirements of 35 USC §112. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

function

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 USC §102

Claims 1, 5-7, 10-13, 17-18 and 20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being unpatentable over Japanese Patent Document No. 52-27398 (Kamakura). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Kamakura is generally directed to a multi-purpose meter having a liquid crystal display. Kamakura does not disclose a resistance element having an adjustable resistance value for changing the voltage imposed on the liquid crystal.

Rather, the rotary switch (12) and adjacent resistor elements (4) are used to change the mode of operation of the meter. For instance, the multi-purpose meter may be used to measure voltage when the rotary switch is in a first position and measure current when the rotary switch is in a second position. Although a change in the rotary switch position may indirectly affect the liquid crystal display, Kamakura does not teach or suggest how to employ a resistance element having an adjustable resistance value to change the voltage imposed on the liquid crystal. Applicant notes a distinction between a liquid crystal display device and a liquid crystal imbedded in the liquid crystal display device.

①
 { ⇒ display
 different value
 depend on R.
 → met claim 1, 5

In contrast, Applicant's claimed invention is directed to a liquid crystal display device. The liquid crystal display device includes a liquid crystal disposed between a pair of substrates. In addition, Claim 1 recites "a resistance element having an adjustable resistance value is disposed on at least one of the pair of substrates to change the voltage imposed on the liquid crystal" in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. In this way, the voltage supplied to the

liquid crystal display device by the host equipment may be fixed to a given voltage, and yet the voltage imposed on the liquid crystal can be adjusted to a prescribed value which is suitable to operate the liquid crystal. Moreover, an optimum display contrast may be achieved by adjusting the resistance value of the resistance element disposed on the substrate. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over Kamakura.

Applicant notes that independent Claims 5, 13, and 21 are directed to similar subject matter, and thus should be allowable, along with claims depending therefrom, for the same reasons as Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

Applicant further notes that new Claims 27-20 have been added to the present application. Claims 27-30 are also directed to a liquid crystal display device. These claims recite "a peripheral circuit having a capacitor disposed on at least one of the pair of substrates" in combination with the other elements recited in the claim. The peripheral circuit, including a capacitor, stabilizes the voltage output from the liquid crystal driving IC as noted on page 27, line 15 thru page 28, line 7 of the specification. None of the cited references teach or suggest such a peripheral circuit. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 27-30 also defines patentable subject matter over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds for rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and further requests that they be withdrawn. Accordingly, it is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this response is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

DRAFT

Dated: August ____, 2001

Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/TDM/mas

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344
Attorneys for Applicants

ATTACHMENT FOR CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The following is a marked up version of each amended claim in which underlines indicates insertions and brackets indicate deletions.

18. (Amended) The liquid crystal display device of Claim 17 further comprising a peripheral circuit disposed between said first and second substrates outboard [overboard] of said seal.